

REMARKS

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 6-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fratkina in view of Marchisio.

Fratkina and Marchisio do not teach or suggest displaying explanations of how well the attributes of the items match the set of target preferences.

Fratkina teaches a system for retrieving information through the use of a multi-stage interaction with a client to identify particular knowledge content associated with a knowledge map (Abstract). In operation, users start a dialog by directing their web browser to a designated web page. This web page asks the user some initial questions that are then passed to a dialog engine. The dialogue engine then applies its methods and algorithms to a knowledge map, using dialog control information and the user's responses to provide feedback to the user. The feedback may include follow-up questions, relevant documents, and instructions to the user. The user can then respond further to the follow-up questions he or she is presented, and the cycle may be repeated. (Paragraph 0014)

To resolve the user's question, the dialogue engine 232 interprets the question, poses other questions to the user, and then interprets the user's answers to eliminate irrelevant concept nodes and traverse a knowledge map 10, as illustrated in Figure 4, as it focuses in on an answer to the user's questions. The knowledge map 10 includes knowledge containers 20, which include

original content and administrative meta-data 50, as illustrated in Figure 5. The administrative meta-data 50 is a set of structured fields that hold typed information about the knowledge container, including who created it, who last modified it, for whom it was created, its title, and a short "synopsis" or description (Paragraphs 0188 and 0189).

Fratkina thus teaches a short description of the content within a knowledge container. Fratkina makes no mention of providing explanations of how well each particular knowledge container matches the user's inquiry. Specifically, Fratkina does not teach or suggest displaying explanations of how well the attributes of the items match the set of target preferences.

Marchisio, in this regard, teaches an information retrieval system that deals with the problems of synonymy, polysemy, and retrieval by concept by allowing for a wide margin of uncertainty in the initial choice of keywords in a query (Abstract). As shown in Figure 1, the system computes a constrained measure of similarity between a query vector and all documents in a term-document matrix (Column 6, lines 35-38). The information retrieval system parses a number of electronic information files containing text. The parsing of the electronic text may include recognizing acronyms, recording word positions, and extracting word roots and generating a number of concept identification numbers corresponding to respective terms to be associated with the rows of the term-document matrix. (Column 6, lines 41-51) Marchisio makes no mention of providing explanations of how well each particular text-document matches the

user's query. Specifically, Marchisio does not does not teach or suggest displaying explanations of how well the attributes of the items match the set of target preferences.

Claim 1 includes displaying explanations of how well the attributes of the items match the set of target preferences. Specifically, claim 1 includes the limitation "generating a display including the list of items and explanations for at least one item on the list of items explaining how well one or more attributes of the at least one item match the set of target preferences."

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Fratkina in view of Marchisio because claim 1 includes a limitation that is not taught or suggested by Fratkina and Marchisio.

Claims 2, 3, and 6-21 are dependent on claim 1 and should be allowable for the same reasons as claim 1 stated above.

Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-3 and 6-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fratkina in view of Marchisio.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fratkina in view of Marchisio as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Busey.

Claims 4-5 are dependent on claim 1 and should be allowable for the same reasons as claim 1 stated above.

Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fratkina in view of Marchisio as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Busey.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant has noted, with appreciation, that the Examiner has indicated that claims 22-26 are allowed.


Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Mark A. Kupanoff at (408) 720-8300.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), applicant(s) hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: November 17, 2004



Mark A. Kupanoff
Reg. No. 55,349

Customer No. 008791
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300